DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 190 028 HE 013 019

AUTHOR Jones, Susan Holtzer
TITLE Employee Development in Student Affairs.
INSTITUTION California Univ., Davis. Office of Student Affairs.
PUB DATE Feb 80
NOTE 18p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Policy; *Administrators; Educational Opportunities; Financial Support; Higher Education; Job Performance; *Middle Management; Motivation; *Professional Development; Promotion (Occupational); *School Personnel; School Surveys; *Staff Development; Status; *Student Personnel Workers
IDENTIFIERS University of California Davis

ABSTRACT

A survey was undertaken of staff in Student Affairs of the University of California at Davis in December 1979. Data gathered in that survey and relating to professional development activities of the staff are presented. The objective is to provide information on development opportunities for those employees, staff participation in them, and need to add or change programs. Over 80 percent of staff reported some participation in university-supported training, slightly more than the campus average. It appears that different types of training opportunities have different constituencies, based on a measure of high or low "employment status." Supervisors were more likely to partake of training opportunities, receive time off with pay, have fees paid by the university, and be allowed an adjusted work schedule. Half the staff had taken academic courses, credit and noncredit. Sixty-eight percent reported familiarity with university policies on employee development, and 34 percent have a development plan. More than two-thirds of management and professional personnel, but only 44 percent of clerical/administrative staff, used opportunities to improve current job performance: more clerical/administrative staff than management and professional staff reported using opportunities for advancement. Policy implications related to differential usage, academic course usage, and training and advancement needs are examined. Data tables are appended. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Susan Holtzer Jones

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Susan Holtzer Jones
Research & Evaluation
Office of Student Affairs
University of California - Davis

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED190028

EMPLOYEE DEVELOPMENT IN STUDENT AFFAIRS

Introduction

Employee Development and Organizational Development, as many writers are at pains to point out, are two very different concepts. Training that contributes to the growth of individuals within an organization may or may not improve the functioning of the organization itself. This report focuses on the human rather than the institutional element in Student Affairs development; it seeks to provide information, as requested by the Staff Development Committee, about: 1) staff development opportunities for Student Affairs employees; 2) the level of staff participation in those opportunities, and 3) the need to add or change programs.

The data in this report were derived from the Student Affairs Staff Survey, distributed to all employees in December, 1979. Response rate to the survey was 64%. (For further information about the survey, please see "Academic 8-to-5'ers," report prepared by this office in February, 1980.)

There are two caveats to this analysis. First and most critical, the survey provides no information regarding amount of usage of each type of development opportunity; that is, it does not indicate, for instance, how many professional meetings each person attended. Second, although 64% is a more-than respectable response rate, the reader must remember that a full one-third of staff are not included here; and because the responses are not a random sample, one can generalize only with caution. It may be, for instance, that respondents are more likely to have participated in various forms of training than nonrespondents.

Level of Participation

The great majority of staff -- 81% -- have participated in at least some University-supported training. This compares favorably to the results of the 1979 survey done by the Staff Personnel Office, which found that 75% of their sample of the total campus staff had participated. Usage of most types of training were similar; the major difference was in professional meetings and conferences -- 54% of Student Affairs staff had attended at least one University-supported meeting, compared to only 27% of the Campuswide sample. More Student Affairs staff also participated in training at their own time and expense -- 66%, compared to only 55% Campuswide.

HE 013 019

The most heavily-used University-supported training opportunities were employee development courses -- 55% of staff have participated in at least one such course -- and professional meetings. Another 40% reported some informal on-the-job training. Much lower levels of usage were reported for the other categories -- only 11% have had any cross-training or internship, 12% have taken University-supported academic credit courses, and 10% have had University-supported noncredit academic courses.

Most reported receiving "hard" support -- time off with pay (64%) and/or fees paid by the University (41%). "Soft" support, such as time off without pay and/or adjusted work schedules, was less often used. And only 4% utilized the Reduced-Fee policy.

At their own expense, staff attended professional meetings (38%) and academic credit courses (28%) most heavily, while a smaller proportion (19%) had taken a noncredit academic course.

Development Usage Patterns

Employment Status. The data indicate that different types of training opportunities have different primary constituencies. In particular, there appears to be a pattern of differential usage based on what may be called "employment status" (ES).

Just as sociologists use certain demographic data to indicate levels of socioeconomic status (SES), equivalent job-related variables can be used to indicate levels of employment status. Here, education, salary and occupational category were used to analyze patterns of development use; they have been divided into only two categories -- "high" and "low" -- both for simplicity and because of intrinsic limitations to the data. In each case, the breaking point between "high" and "low" was selected in order to provide as nearly as possible equal numbers of staff in each group. The category breakdowns are:

Education: low--B.A. degree or less; high--some graduate work or more.
Occupational category: low--clerical/administrative, technical and other; high--management and professional.
Salary: low--$14,999 or less per year; high--$15,000 or more per year (actual salary, not adjusted yearly rate).

These three ES variables were correlated with each of the employee development questions (a correlation matrix is provided in Appendix I, Table 4). As the matrix indicates, not every ES variable is significantly correlated to all development questions (nor, for that matter, is every statistically significant relationship large enough to be important.) With only three exceptions, however, each question is significantly correlated with at least one of the ES variables, and the direction of the other two ES variables is the same. (The exceptions are on-the-job training and both supported and unsupported academic noncredit courses.)

Based on these data, it can be suggested that high-ES staff tend to participate in development opportunities somewhat more than low-ES staff, in both University-supported and nonsupported categories. There is, however,

a reversal of this direction in regard to internal University opportunities -- in this category, low-ES staff are more likely to participate.

Employee development courses, for instance, are more likely to be used by those with less education (r=-.21*) and lower salaries, and those in clerical and/or technical job categories. The same relationships exist for use of cross-training and internships.

External opportunities, on the other hand, tend to be more often used by high-ES staff. For instance, attendance at both supported and nonsupported professional meetings is strongly correlated to all three ES variables.* And enrollment in academic credit courses, also both supported and unsupported, is positively related to higher salaries,* more education, and management and professional job categories.

Three types of development opportunities show no particular relationship to employment status -- on-the-job training is used almost equally by all groups, while use of noncredit academic courses provides ambiguous or conflicting patterns within the group of ES variables.

Other relationships. Perhaps the strongest link to University support was supervisory status, which was positively related+ to all types of supported opportunities except academic courses and cross-training/internships. Supervisors were also more likely to receive time off with pay+ to have their fees paid by the University+ and to be permitted an adjusted work schedule.+ In fact, supervisors reported higher usage than nonsupervisors on every single development measure in the survey.

There were also significant differences in development usage between the different Student Affairs units. Unit was significantly related+ to all University-supported activities except on-the-job training and noncredit academic courses. Units also differed in type of contribution they provided their staff, including significant differences in time off with pay and payment of fees.+ (Unit breakouts are provided in Appendix I, Table 1).

While sex is related to a number of usage measures, it may be that this represents an employment rather than a specifically sex-linked relationship. Because women staff are clustered in the clerical category, and have generally lower salaries and substantially less education than men, it is not surprising that the data show women generally following the low-ES pattern. For instance, women are less likely than men to have participated in external University-supported training, and more likely to have participated in employee development courses+ and cross-training or internships. Women are also much less likely to have had any self-supported training.+

*Pearson's r significant at .05 or above.
+X^2 significant at .05 or above.

In one regard -- type of University contribution -- women did not follow the low-ES pattern. For instance, while time off with pay correlated with higher salary* and management/professional job category, it was provided to more women than men. Payment of fees by the University was roughly equal for both sexes. The only significant difference between men and women regarding type of University contribution was in time made up+ -- more men than women reported being able to make up missed work hours. This option was used most often by professionals (15%), less in the apparently less-flexible management (9%) and clerical (8%) categories.

Use of Academic Opportunities. Academic courses form a major part of development for Student Affairs staff, virtually all of it at their own time and expense. In total, exactly 50% of staff have taken at least one academic course. While 32% have taken one or more courses for academic credit, only 12% received any University support for such courses; 25% have taken noncredit courses, but only 10% received University support. In all, 21% of staff reported support for any academic offering, compared to 54% who received support for professional meetings or conferences.

ACADEMIC USAGE
BY STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF

	Any Academic Courses	Any Academic Credit Courses	Any Academic Noncredit Courses
Total Staff	49.5	32.4	24.7
Male	51.7	37.9	22.4
Female	48.1	29.0	26.2

Staff in high-ES categories were somewhat more likely to have taken any academic courses, credit or noncredit. While men were more likely to have taken courses for credit,+ women were slightly more likely to have taken noncredit courses. Use of the Reduced-Fee Program was a vanishingly small 4%, and there were virtually no differences between men and women, or among ES measures.

Awareness and Involvement

Sixty-eight percent of staff say they are familiar with the University's policies regarding employee development; 40% discussed training during their last performance evaluation, and 34% have an employee development plan.

There were significant differences between Student Affairs units on these measures, often with very large discrepancies. For instance, 77% of those in Financial Aid said training was discussed during their last performance evaluation, compared to none in the Registrar's Office. Eighty-five percent of staff in Financial Aid and 71% in Housing have an employee development plan, compared to less than 10% for Registrar, Student Health and the Police Department. Supervisors tended to have more involvement than nonsupervisors on all three measures.

These three measures of involvement and awareness tended to be somewhat higher among low-ES staff; however, the significant differences were often in the middle ranges. For instance, training was more likely to be discussed with those who had a B.A. than those with either less or more education; it was also more likely to be discussed with those earning between $10,000 and $20,000 than with those higher or lower on the salary scale. (Complete data are in Appendix I, Table 1.)

Measures of familiarity with employee development policies show a somewhat similar pattern. Those with a B.A. were more likely to know these policies than those with more or less education; professional staff were less likely to be familiar with these policies than either managerial or clerical staff. There were no differences by salary level.

Education is the only ES variable significantly related to actually having an employee development plan, and here also the middle ranges are the most likely to participate -- 43% of those with a B.A., and 44% of those with some graduate study or an M.A., compared to 31% of those with less than a B.A. and only 10% of those with a Ph.D. or professional degree. Professionals and clerical staff were also somewhat more likely to have a plan than were those in management. (Note that, while an employee development plan is required for University-supported courses or training programs, it is <u>not</u> required for University-supported attendance at conferences, meetings or participation in professional associations.[P&P 380-41: IIB2b, IIC3b, IID, IIE]).

Perhaps the single most predictive variable on these measures, however, is sex, and here the relationship seems substantially higher than might be concluded from the employment-status variables. For instance, 48% of women, compared to only 27% of men, said training was discussed during their performance evaluation, and 41% of women, compared to only 24% of men, are familiar with development policies and procedures. (All three measures have X^2 significant at .05 or above). These are far stronger relationships than can be explained by the other variables involved.

(Parenthetically, an employee development plan is the only measure on which ethnicity was significantly related -- 49% of minority staff, compared to 32% ofnonminority, had such a plan.)

<u>Staff Goals and Motivations</u>

Staff's primary purpose for engaging in training activities also varies with employment status. Thus, while more than two-thirds of management and professional personnel utilized training to improve their current job performance, this was true of only 44% of clerical/administrative staff. Less than a fourth of management or professionals used such training for advancement, compared to 44% of clericals.+ Salary level was also related, with those at lower levels more likely to use training for advancement.+ As might be expected, therefore, more women than men used training for advancement purposes.+

All employees, regardless of category, want management training more than any other single type of development opportunity. Forty-four percent said such training would help them in their present job; 39% said they needed it for advancement. A higher proportion of men than women specified management training in both categories, but it was the top-ranked selection for both. (A complete list of desired training topics is included as Table 2 in Appendix I.)

Policy Implications

Differential usage. As noted, the data indicate that staff in low-ES categories are more likely to use internal development offerings, while those in high-ES categories are more likely to take advantage of external opportunities such as courses and conferences. This difference is open to several different interpretations.

First, it may be that, through its internal mechanisms, the University is providing training opportunities to those who would find it difficult to use external sources, for reasons of finances, time or other problems. It is also possible that, at the same time, internal offerings are too limited to appeal to those in high-ES categories. (Analysis of the actual offerings involved, and attitudes toward them, would be necessary to clarify this question.) Finally, it also may be that University policies and procedures regarding employee development limit the ability of low-ES staff to take advantage of external training opportunities.

Certain elements of these University policies, as provided in P & P Manual Section 380-41, have potential impact on various forms of training and education usage. To begin with, all opportunities are at the absolute discretion of the supervisor; there is no automatic right to participate in any kind of training. (P&P 380-41: IIB2a, IIC1a, IIC2a, IID1, IIG). This survey did not ask whether any staff member had ever been refused permission for training, or for what reasons; however, even assuming the highest level of good will and permissiveness on the part of supervisors, it seems possible that some employees will be reluctant to request this permission.

A second potentially limiting aspect of University policy is the fact that, under currently existing regulations, the University will only reimburse staff for fees already paid; the staff member must first pay all fees her/himself. (P&P 380-41: IVB5; this provision may be changed shortly.) This requirement could easily create difficulties for employees at lower salary levels; a single concurrent course, for instance, costs more than $70, and some extension courses cost even more.

The final limiting factor is the requirement that all University-supported development be work-related. (P&P 380-41: IIB2, IIC3.) This is an eminently reasonable position for a noncharitable organization to take; still, it has the effect of limiting the flexibility and mobility of staff, particularly in terms of possible lateral moves.

The "work-related" requirement may have a particularly stultifying effect on clerical staff. Tightly construed, it could easily limit their development opportunities to purely clerical skills, thereby locking them ever more firmly into clerical positions. For those clerical staff interested in advancement, a strict interpretation could represent a major barrier.

Academic course usage. Seventeen percent of staff said they needed an academic degree for advancement, and indeed 15% are currently working on a degree or credential (although these are not necessarily the same people.) The most revealing breakout is by education -- 26% of those with a bachelor's degree wanted another degree, compared to 16% of those with less and 14% of those with more than a B.A. Perhaps the most startling figure was the 0% -- not a single one -- of those with no college at all. It may be that these staff, confronted with the four long years of undergraduate work, simply do not feel a college education would be feasible, or worth the effort.

As noted above, of course, large numbers of staff are in fact taking advantage of various academic offerings, outside formal degree programs. And while this kind of academic usage may provide excellent training, it does present problems of credentialism. One recommendation which might be considered is expansion of certificate programs through University Extension; this might be a particularly useful direction for staff who lack (and do not care to get) a bachelor's degree.

The comparatively low level of University support for academic coursework, compared to support for meetings and conferences, seems to suggest the need for further investigation. It may be that many staff members are unaware that such courses are eligible for support, or perhaps may feel they are harder to justify to supervisors.

The low use of the Reduced-Fee Program -- only 4% -- seems likely to increase if proposed policy changes go into effect. The increase from a 6- to a 9-credit-hour limit raises the effective course load from one to two courses per quarter, making a degree much more feasible. Along with this, proposed expansion of the program to include part-time as well as full-time staff should also make the program more attractive -- it seems likely that a 40-hour work week, combined with 8 or 9 course hours, would overload all but the most grimly determined staff member. One response from Student Affairs which would be especially helpful would be permission for staff to work a reduced schedule while working on a degree program.

Training and advancement. Table 2 of Appendix I contains a list of educational areas in which staff indicated an interest. Most are either currently available or quite feasible; however, the apparent overwhelming desire for management training seems to raise more questions than it answers. It seems legitimate to conjecture whether that many staff actually want management jobs, or whether they simply feel management is the only area of opportunity open to them. If the figures represent actual and specific motivation, the new School of Administration can be filled from within our own ranks; if, however, they represent generalized desire for career improvement, then other solutions deserve consideration.

This problem is addressed in a set of development principles from the General Electric Corporation, which notes: "Management performance is a distinct kind of work and those who work best as individual contributors must be rewarded separately."[1] And Scott[2] deals with the same problem when he points out that institutions want "competent, highly motivated staff who, similar to research faculty, are 'self-starters.' But similar incentives -- leaves, tenure, and adequate resources -- are not provided." He suggests three types of incentives:

Structural incentives -- such as job rotations; administrative councils; adequate resources.
Benefit incentives -- such as tuition remission for family; merit pay; leaves of absence; early retirement.
Psychological incentives -- such as job security; recognition; trust; high expectations.

Many of these incentives are, in fact, mirrored in the discussion topics suggested by staff in response to the survey. (A list of topic areas and examples of specific suggestions are included as Appendix III). Personnel policies -- both existing and innovative -- along with promotion and advancement issues, were of major interest, particularly to women. Job exchanges were mentioned; so were sabbatical leaves, recognition, and the role of staff in the decision-making process. These subjects may merit consideration in the process of rewarding the individual contributors in Student Affairs.

---

[1] Dutton, Thomas B. "Staff Development," memo to Student Affairs Staff Development Committee, University of California Davis, January 16, 1980.

[2] Scott, Robert A. Lords, Squires and Yeomen: Collegiate Middle Managers and their Organizations. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1978.

APPENDIX I

TABLE 1

EMPLOYEE DEVELOPMENT USAGE
IN STUDENT AFFAIRS

University-Supported Training-1

	Any Training	Employee Developmt.	On-the-job Training	Training/ Intnshps.
Total Staff	80.6	55.0	39.8	10.7
Sex:				
Male	83.6	44.0	39.7	6.0
Female	80.9	63.0	39.3	12.6
Education:				
Less than B.A.	73.4	62.4	39.4	15.6
B.A.	87.3	66.7	44.4	15.9
Some grad/M.A.	83.3	47.8	45.6	5.6
Ph.D./Prof. degree	85.4	31.7	22.0	0.0
Occupational Category:				
Management	88.9	64.4	26.7	6.7
Professional	89.1	47.9	44.5	10.1
Clerical/Admin.	75.4	65.3	41.5	14.4
Other	57.9	26.3	26.3	0.0
Salary:				
Less than $10,000	55.6	29.6	25.9	7.4
$10,000-14,999	81.2	61.7	43.8	11.7
$15,000-19,999	84.1	58.7	47.6	14.3
$20,000 or more	88.2	50.6	32.9	5.9
Supervisory Status:				
Supervisor	90.9	69.5	45.7	12.8
Nonsupervisor	70.4	38.7	33.1	7.7
Unit:				
Adm/RWS/EOP	83.3	58.3	50.0	4.2
Financial Aid	91.2	82.4	58.8	41.2
Housing	85.3	64.7	41.2	2.9
Registrar	54.5	45.5	36.4	9.1
Student Health	68.3	22.0	26.8	0.0
Union/Rec. Serices	79.3	58.6	37.9	3.4
Police Dept.	97.0	42.4	54.5	6.1
Student Developmt.	88.9	62.2	33.3	4.4
Other	70.7	53.7	29.3	19.5

TABLE 1 (page 2)

EMPLOYEE DEVELOPMENT USAGE
IN STUDENT AFFAIRS

University-Supported Training-2

	Prof. Meetings/ Conferences	Acad. Cred. Courses	Noncredit Acad. Courses	Other
Total Staff	54.4	11.7	9.7	6.8
Sex:				
Male	63.8	14.7	8.6	10.3
Female	49.2	9.8	10.9	4.9
Education:				
Less than B.A.	35.8	9.2	10.1	6.4
B.A.	57.1	7.9	9.5	19.0
Some grad/M.A.	65.6	16,7	12.2	8.9
Ph.D./Prof. degree	73.2	9.8	0.0	4.9
Occupational Category:				
Management	77.8	8.9	6.7	8.9
Professional	72.3	16.0	16.0	10.1
Clerical/Admin.	32.2	8.5	6.8	3.4
Other	42.1	10.5	0.0	5.3
Salary:				
Less than $10,000	22.2	0.0	3.7	3.7
$10,000-14,999	43.0	10.2	10.2	3.9
$15,000-19,999	60.3	14.3	11.1	11.1
$20,000 or more	77.6	15.3	10.6	9.4
Supervisory Status:				
Supervisor	72.0	12.8	11.6	8.5
Nonsupervisor	34.5	9.9	7.7	4.9
Unit:				
Adm/RWS/EOP	62.5	8.3	8.3	4.2
Financial Aid	61.8	11.8	8.8	20.6
Housing	58.8	11.8	2.9	2.9
Registrar	27.3	0.0	9.1	0.0
Student Health	46.3	7.3	2.4	2.4
Union/Rec Services	51.7	3.4	10.3	6.9
Police Dept.	51.5	21.2	15.2	18.2
Student Devel.	75.6	26.7	20.0	4.4
Other	39.0	4.9	7.3	2.4

TABLE 1 (page 3)

EMPLOYEE DEVELOPMENT USAGE
IN STUDENT AFFAIRS

Type of University Contribution

	Time off w/o Pay	Time Made Up	Reduced-Fee Policy	Time Off With Pay	Univ. Paid Fees	Other
Total Staff	6.5	11.3	3.6	64.1	40.8	6.8
Sex:						
Male	8.6	16.4	3.4	61.2	40.5	9.5
Female	4.9	8.2	3.3	68.9	41.0	4.4
Education:						
Less than B.A.	5.5	9.2	2.8	59.6	33.0	4.5
B.A.	0.0	14.3	1.6	74.6	39.7	6.3
Some grad/M.A.	9.1	11.1	4.0	57.6	50.5	5.1
Ph.D./Prof.	12.2	4.9	4.9	63.4	29.3	12.2
Occupational Category:						
Management	8.9	8.9	4.4	75.6	46.7	4.4
Professional	10.1	15.1	4.2	69.7	47.1	8.4
Clerical/Admin.	3.4	7.6	2.5	61.9	35.6	3.4
Other	0.0	15.8	0.0	42.1	26.3	10.5
Salary:						
Less than $10,000	7.4	3.7	0.0	29.6	25.9	11.1
$10,000-14,999	4.7	10.2	4.7	64.1	38.3	3.9
$15,000-19,999	4.8	7.9	4.8	71.4	49.2	6.3
$20,000 or more	10.6	17.6	1.2	74.1	41.2	8.2
Supervisory Status:						
Supervisor	6.7	16.5	4.3	74.4	50.6	6.1
Nonsupervisor	6.3	4.9	2.1	54.2	28.9	7.0
Unit:						
Adm/RWS/EOP	0.0	8.3	0.0	66.7	45.8	4.2
Financial Aid	8.8	14.7	2.9	82.4	52.9	0.0
Housing	0.0	14.7	8.8	70.6	52.9	5.9
Registrar	9.1	9.1	0.0	36.4	18.2	0.0
Student Health	9.8	4.9	2.4	41.5	12.2	12.2
Union/Rec Services	6.9	3.4	0.0	65.5	55.2	0.0
Police Department	12.1	24.2	0.0	69.7	33.3	18.2
Student Development	8.9	13.3	8.9	73.3	53.3	8.9
Other	4.9	4.9	2.4	63.4	34.1	4.9

TABLE 1 (page 4)

EMPLOYEE DEVELOPMENT USAGE
IN STUDENT AFFAIRS

Non-University-Supported Training

	Any Training	Academ. Credit Courses	Noncred. Academ. Courses	Prof. Mtgs/ Confs.	Other
Total Staff	65.7	28.2	18.8	37.5	8.1
Sex:					
Male	82.8	32.8	17.2	57.8	8.6
Female	54.1	24.0	19.7	25.1	7.7
Education:					
Less than B.A.	48.6	22.0	13.8	19.3	5.5
B.A.	61.9	28.6	19.0	23.8	12.7
Some grad/M.A.	76.8	28.3	18.2	44.4	5.1
Ph.D./Prof.	92.7	31.7	24.4	75.6	7.3
Occupational Category:					
Management	75.6	33.3	8.9	60.0	4.4
Professional	77.3	29.4	24.4	55.5	10.9
Clerical/Admin.	52.5	22.9	20.3	12.7	6.8
Other	57.9	36.8	0.0	31.6	5.3
Salary:					
Less than $10,000	44.4	22.2	11.1	14.8	0.0
$10,000-14,999	56.3	23.4	20.3	20.3	9.4
$15,000-19,999	65.1	28.6	23.8	41.3	6.3
$20,000 or more	84.7	36.5	14.4	68.2	9.4
Supervisory Status:					
Supervisor	69.5	31.1	18.9	44.5	7.9
Nonsupervisor	60.6	23.9	18.3	28.9	7.7
Unit:					
Adm/Fws/EOP	75.0	41.7	25.5	16.7	0.0
Financial Aid	52.9	29.4	17.6	29.4	5.9
Housing	47.1	11.8	17.6	32.4	0.0
Registrar	54.5	18.2	27.3	0.0	9.1
Student Health	80.5	29.3	22.0	51.2	4.9
Union/Rec. Services	55.2	27.6	17.2	34.5	10.3
Police Department	63.6	39.4	15.2	36.4	6.1
Student Development	80.0	31.1	17.8	53.3	15.6
Other	65.9	19.5	19.5	43.9	14.6

TABLE 1 (page 5)

EMPLOYEE DEVELOPMENT USAGE
IN STUDENT AFFAIRS

Purpose and Involvement

	Purpose of Training					
	Job Perf.	Advce-ment	Self-Imprv.	Discussed Training	Know P & P	Have Empl. Dev. Plan
Total Staff	55.1	29.8	10.6	40.1	68.2	34.4
Sex:						
Male	60.6	21.1	12.8	27.4	61.7	23.5
Female	52.0	36.0	8.0	47.5	73.5	41.4
Education:						
Less than B.A.	55.4	34.9	9.6	45.8	70.6	30.6
B.A.	48.0	34.0	18.0	50.0	79.0	42.9
Some grad/M.A.	59.7	31.2	9.1	41.1	67.8	44.4
Ph.D./Prof.	75.7	13.5	10.8	12.8	50.0	10.0
Occupational Category:						
Management	70.0	20.0	10.0	22.2	81.4	30.2
Professional	67.6	24.5	7.8	42.2	56.8	37.3
Clerical/Admin.	43.8	43.8	12.4	50.9	74.4	38.5
Other	33.3	50.0	16.7	21.1	78.9	15.8
Salary:						
Less than $10,000	52.9	35.3	11.8	38.5	57.7	37.0
$10,000-14,999	42.4	42.4	15.2	54.4	71.9	35.4
$15,000-19,999	64.8	27.8	7.4	33.3	72.1	37.7
$20,000 or more	72.2	20.3	7.6	27.7	65.5	29.8
Supervisory Status:						
Supervisor	59.7	28.5	11.8	44.8	76.5	45.1
Nonsupervisor	55.1	35.5	9.3	35.5	59.3	22.9
Unit:						
Adm/RWS/EOP	55.0	35.0	10.0	37.5	70.8	33.3
Financial Aid	53.6	35.7	10.7	76.5	97.1	85.3
Housing	62.5	29.2	8.3	69.7	76.5	70.6
Registrar	33.3	50.0	16.7	0.0	63.6	0.0
Student Health	75.7	16.2	8.1	25.0	46.2	5.1
Union/Rec. Services	47.8	30.4	21.7	31.0	72.4	10.7
Police Department	64.3	32.1	3.6	18.8	46.9	6.3
Student Development	60.0	32.5	7.5	50.0	75.6	44.4
Other	45.5	39.4	15.2	27.5	67.5	29.3

TABLE 2

FURTHER TRAINING OR EDUCATION DESIRED

	To Improve Present Job Performance						To Improve Chances For Advancement					
	Total (n=150)	Male (n=63)	Female (n=84)	Manage-ment (n=25)	Profes-sional (n=54)	Cler/ Admin (n=58)	Total (n=137)	Male (n=48)	Female (n=87)	Manage-ment (n=16)	Profes-sional (n=50)	Cler/ Admin (n=63)
Adm/Mgmt	44.0	52.4	36.9	64.0	48.1	32.8	39.1	50.0	33.3	62.5	48.0	27.0
Acct/Bdgtng	20.7	15.9	23.8	24.0	13.0	31.0	18.1	14.6	19.5	25.0	12.0	23.8
Sprvsry Skills	17.3	19.0	16.7	16.0	16.7	19.0	13.0	10.4	14.9	12.5	8.0	17.5
Computer/DP	12.0	7.9	15.5	8.0	13.0	15.5	8.7	8.3	9.2	0.0	10.0	11.1
Unit-specific	12.0	12.7	11.9	16.0	9.3	12.1	2.2	2.1	2.3	0.0	2.0	3.2
Med. In-serv.	7.3	4.8	9.5	4.0	13.0	0.0	2.9	0.0	4.6	0.0	4.0	0.0
Personnel	6.7	6.3	7.1	8.0	9.3	5.2	4.3	4.2	4.6	0.0	8.0	3.2
Language	6.7	3.2	9.5	8.0	1.9	12.1	4.3	2.1	5.7	6.3	2.0	4.8
Academ. Degree	6.7	6.3	7.1	4.0	9.3	6.9	16.7	22.9	13.0	18.8	14.0	20.6
Writing	4.0	1.6	6.0	4.0	3.7	5.2	5.1	0.0	8.0	6.3	0.0	9.5
Stud. Relations	4.0	3.2	3.6	0.0	3.7	5.2	3.6	2.1	4.6	6.3	2.0	4.8
Interpersonal	4.0	0.0	7.1	0.0	0.0	10.3	1.4	2.1	1.1	0.0	2.0	1.6
Stress Mgmt.	3.3	4.8	2.4	4.0	3.7	3.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Exper. Learning	2.7	1.6	3.6	0.0	5.6	1.7	11.6	16.7	9.2	12.5	12.0	9.5
Clerical	2.7	0.0	4.8	0.0	0.0	6.9	4.3	0.0	6.9	0.0	0.0	9.5
U customs	2.7	3.2	1.2	8.0	1.9	1.7	6.5	4.2	5.7	6.3	10.0	3.2
Time Mgmt.	2.0	3.2	1.2	4.0	1.9	1.7	0.7	0.0	1.1	0.0	0.0	1.6
Statistics	0.7	1.6	0.0	0.0	1.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other	10.7	17.5	6.0	4.0	14.8	5.2	8.0	10.4	6.9	0.0	14.0	4.8

TABLE 3

EMPLOYEE DEVELOPMENT USAGE
BY EMPLOYMENT-STATUS VARIABLES

	Education[1]		Occupation[2]		Salary[3]	
	high	low	high	low	high	low
Any U-spptd. training	84.0	78.5	89.0	73.0	86.5	76.8
Empl. Devel. courses	42.7	64.0	52.4	59.9	54.1	56.1
On-the-job training	38.2	41.3	39.6	39.4	39.2	40.6
Cross-training/intnships	3.8	15.7	9.1	12.4	9.5	11.0
Prof. meetings/confs.	67.9	43.6	73.8	33.6	70.3	39.4
Acad. credit courses	14.5	8.7	14.0	8.8	14.9	8.4
Noncred. acad. courses	8.4	9.9	13.4	5.8	10.8	9.0
Any non-spptd. training	80.2	53.5	76.8	53.3	76.4	54.2
Non-spptd. acad. credit	31.3	24.4	30.5	24.8	33.1	23.2
Non-spptd. noncredit	21.4	15.7	20.1	17.5	18.2	18.7
Non-spptd. prof. meetings	57.3	20.9	56.7	15.3	56.8	19.4
Any acad. cred. courses	36.6	29.1	36.0	29.2	37.8	28.4
Any acad. noncred. courses	26.0	22.1	28.7	20.4	24.3	24.5
Any academic courses	53.4	45.3	54.3	44.5	53.4	45.8
Time off w/o pay	10.7	3.5	9.8	2.9	8.1	5.2
Time off with pay	63.4	65.1	71.3	59.1	73.0	58.1
Time made up	9.9	11.0	13.4	8.8	13.5	9.0
Univ. paid fees	47.3	35.5	47.0	34.3	44.6	36.1
Reduced-Fee policy	4.6	2.3	4.3	2.2	2.7	3.9

[1] High=more than B.A. degree; Low=B.A. or less.

[2] High=Management and Professional job categories; Low=Clerical, Technical and Other categories.

[3] High=$15,000 or more; Low=$14,999 or less.

TABLE 4

SIGNIFICANT CORRELATIONS
OF TRAINING MEASURES
WITH EMPLOYMENT-STATUS VARIABLES[1]

	Educ.	Occup. Category	Salary
Any supported training		.21	.13
Employee Devel. courses	-.21		
On-the-job training			
Cross-trng/internships	-.19		
Supptd. prof. meetings	.24	.40	.31
Supptd. acad. cred. courses			.10
Supptd. acad. noncredit		.13	
Any unsupported training	.28	.25	.23
Unsupptd. acad. credit			.11
Unsupptd. acad. noncredit			
Unsupptd. prof. meetings	.37	.42	.39
Any acad. credit courses			.10
Any acad. noncredit courses		.09	
Any academic courses		.10	
Time off without pay	.14	.14	
Time made up			
Reduced-Fee Policy			
Time off with pay		.13	.16
University paid fees	.12	.13	

[1]Number in each cell is Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient, significant at the .05 level or above. Empty cells indicate correlation was not statistically significant at that level.